

105

**RA-RS-76-2019 in
RSA-633-2016**

**JEET SINGH AND ANOTHER
V/S
DALJIT KAUR AND OTHERS**

Present: None for the applicant/appellants.

Even on second call, there is no representation on behalf of the applicant/appellants.

On 26.07.2023, the review application was dismissed for non-prosecution and the said order is extracted below for convenience:-

“No one has appeared on behalf of the applicants-appellants despite the case having been called twice.

The present review application came up for preliminary hearing for the first time on 26.08.2019. Learned counsel for the applicants-appellants sought time to seek no objection from the previous counsel. Thereafter on 30.09.2019 and 22.11.2019, no one appeared on behalf of the applicants-appellants. On 05.02.2020, a request for adjournment was made and it was observed, while granting adjournment, that no further adjournment would be granted. Thereafter on subsequent dates also, the matter was not argued and on most of the dates, learned counsel for the applicants-appellants did not appear. Today also, no one has appeared despite the case having been called twice. It appears that the applicants-appellants are not interested in pursuing the present review application.

Dismissed for non-prosecution.”

On an application having been preferred for restoration of review application, learned counsel for the applicant-appellants had assured this Court that he shall vigilantly pursue the review application, in case the same is restored by this Court. Accordingly, the review application was restored vide order dated 12.07.2024. The operative part of said order reads as thus:-

“Learned counsel for the applicant-appellant submits that the non appearance on 26.07.2023 was on account of reasons beyond the control of learned counsel. He submits that he shall vigilantly pursue the review application in case the same is restored by this Court.

For the reasons mentioned in the application and considering the submissions made by learned counsel for the applicant-appellants, the same is allowed. The order dated 26.07.2023 vide which the review application was dismissed for non prosecution is recalled and the review application is restored to its original number.”

Despite the assurance given by learned counsel for applicant-appellants, as recorded in order dated 12.07.2024, the applicant-appellants remain unrepresented.

In view of the above, it is safe for this Court to infer that applicant-appellants are not interested in pursuing the present review application.

Dismissed for non-prosecution.

July 29, 2024
Varinder

**(VIKAS SURI)
JUDGE**